

You cannot get that type of return on Wall Street. That was about a 10 percent return. You cannot get a return like that on any other investment where you give \$86 million to influence the people's House and get \$14.5 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money, and energy is trading at \$75 a barrel.

I understand if you want to help the oil and gas companies at \$17 a barrel, \$25 a barrel to help them drill for energy. At \$75 a barrel, I would expect Exxon and Mobil and Chevron and Phillips, all who are making not just good money, historic record prices, would actually be able to go on their own and drill without the taxpayers having to pay for it.

So not only are we paying a record amount of \$3.50 a gallon, not only are they making record profits, but at \$75 a barrel, the taxpayers are paying them \$14.5 billion. So the American consumer pays more at the pump, and they pay more on April 15 because of what this Congress did. Over the last year, in less than 1 year, energy went from \$2.09 to \$3.30, but that is only one example.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMANUEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that we are drilling for oil in Texas, California, Oklahoma, and Nebraska. How did the gentleman vote when we wanted to drill in the ANWR, which is 3.5 times the size of Texas? We could have gotten almost 2 million barrels of oil a day, and it would have helped these prices.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I voted against that; and I vote against giving them \$14.5 billion because I do not believe there is a worse example of corporate welfare, only to be followed by the prescription drug bill and the corporate tax bill that was a \$5 billion problem. You all handed out \$145 billion to corporate interests. Only in Washington do you try to resolve a \$5 billion problem that cost you \$145 billion, and it still did not resolve the original \$5 billion problem.

I bring this all up for one simple point: For the last 5 years, this is supposed to be the people's House, and when that gavel comes down, it is supposed to open the people's House, not the auction house. And from the prescription drug legislation to the energy legislation to the corporate tax bill, you have sold off America's interests. Billions of dollars have been spent lobbying the people's House, and it shows when you go from product to product, from line to line. That is what has happened here.

Now all of a sudden everybody is worried about how we are going to deal with the energy problem. When you had an energy bill, you hailed it as a great victory for the American people. Since that time energy has gone up more than a buck a gallon at the pump.

But that is also an example of what has happened with the corporate tax

bill and the pharmaceutical bill. People have used their influence. I do not bemoan what the energy companies have done. I do not bemoan what the pharmaceutical companies have done. I do not bemoan what the HMO industry has done. I do not bemoan what corporate interests have done to influence this Congress. What I bemoan is what the Congress has done for that money and what they have done to the American people's interests. And what is happening here, because now this week I think it is ironic we are all talking about energy, this Congress is going to bring up a lobbying bill. That piece of legislation has become the incredible shrinking legislation. It does nothing. The Washington Post called it "a watered down sham. Simply a joke."

USA Today writes, "Congress still doesn't get it. After more than a year of negative headlines about political corruption and money-soaked alliances with lobbyists, House leaders are weakening their already anemic excuse for reform."

It doesn't deal with an independent Office of Public Integrity. It does not ban gifts from lobbyists. It does not close the revolving door for Members who leave here. It does not deal with disclosure of lobbyists' solicitation of campaign checks.

The lobbying legislation we are dealing with is exactly the energy legislation we dealt with. The two are the same pieces of legislation. Those who have given and they are giving their checks because all that is left on K Street is checks. There are no checks and balances left in this system.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5020, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-438) on the resolution (H. Res. 774) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5020) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, with mounting sectarian tensions and unabated insurgent violence, I rise today to discuss the deeply troubling situation in Iraq and its implications for the national interests of the United States.

Sometimes it is harder to know how to end a war than to start one. Just as it is important to think through the "why" of committing troops to a conflict, we must also think through the "why" of ending an engagement. Timing is a key element of both considerations.

Perspective is always difficult to bring to bear on events of the day. Developments of this week, however, could provide Washington with a seminal opportunity to stimulate a rethinking about the philosophical basis for a war that we initiated, with the goal of assessing how a great power can and should disengage.

Many people have noted analogies between America's involvement in Vietnam and the U.S. intervention in Iraq. My sense is that a number of these analogies are quite frail. But the one I am most concerned about relates to America's extraordinary difficulty in disengaging from Vietnam.

A key problem for Washington in trying to wind down its commitment in Vietnam was how to develop a mutual accommodation with the other side that would lessen the prideful pitfalls that often occur when political figures are forced to reassess policies. In the end it was the Paris Peace Accord which facilitated the withdrawal of American troops.

A negotiating avenue in a third-country capital does not appear to lend itself to a resolution of the Iraqi situation at this time. Nonetheless, I find it remarkable that in an autobiographical tome Henry Kissinger wrote that in December 1968, shortly after Richard Nixon had asked him to be his National Security Council Director, he met with the President-elect to discuss the direction of the new administration's foreign policy. They determined together, he noted, that their policy would be to get out of Vietnam.

After reading this passage I asked him years later at a Library of Congress symposium why they did not just proceed to do that. Kissinger looked at me for a moment and then uttered words I will never forget. "Young man," he said, "we meant with honor."

I then asked him if honor required escalation. "Absolutely," he responded.

In the Iraq circumstance, the executive branch has provided three broad rationales for American intervention. First, it hinted that there was an Iraqi connection to the attacks on 9/11. Then